

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

SALEM, OHIO, FRIDAY, MAY 8, 1846.

NO. 43

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

Published every Friday at

SALEM, COLUMBIANA CO., O.

JAMES BARNABY, Jr., General Agent.
BENJAMIN S. JONES, } Editors.
J. ELIZABETH JONES, }

All remittances to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary affairs of the paper, to be addressed (post paid) to the General Agent. Communications intended for insertion to be addressed to the Editors.

TERMS:—\$1.50 per annum, or \$2.00 if not paid within six months of the time of subscribing.

Advertisements making less than a square inserted three times for 75 cents—one square \$1.

PUBLISHING COMMITTEE:—Sam'l Brooke, George Garretson, James Barnaby, Jr., David L. Gallbreath, Lot Holmes.

J. H. PAINTER, PRINTER.

Communications.

REVIEW

OF S. STEEL'S SERMON.

On the 15th of Feb., '46, S. Steel, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, (O. S.) Hillsboro', preached by appointment from the subjoined text, from Eph. 4: 15—"Speaking the truth in love"—a good text, but treated by him as he charges Abolitionists with treating standard religious works—with great neglect. He discarded the spirit of the text almost entirely, and led us to suppose that he loved slaveholders much better than the slave, or his friend, the abolitionist. As for speaking the truth, we suppose he aimed at this, but in the performance, the flesh proved too weak. Copious notes were taken of the sermon, and some remarks will now be offered on it. The speaker devoted nearly fifteen minutes, all told, on slavery and its evils, proving it to be "unrighteous, as a system—ruinous to master and slave—inconsistent with the bible—effects always bad, &c. &c." His next head was, that "many draw erroneous inferences from the effects alluded to." On this he spoke nearly two hours. The first erroneous inference was, that "abolitionists say slavery is immoral"—that slaveholders are therefore thieves and robbers, and should be excluded from the church. A great mistake, for many of them were converted.—Would God convert a thief! Absurd!—Let us examine this position a little. God converted the thief on the cross. But this is aside from the question, which is not, would God convert a thief, but will he remain such afterwards? Had the thief on the cross been pardoned, like Barabbas, would he have relapsed into his former course? And if he had, would he have been fellowshiped by the Apostles? Who says yes? S. Steel.—Pretty well for one who signed his name to the Constitution of the Am. A. S. Society, along side Garrison, the Tappans, Gerrit Smith and others, and whose article, proving slavery to be sinful, caused Breckenridge's Magazine to be burned in Petersburg, Va. In taking this ground there is but little danger of his being thought a fanatic. There is much more of his being thought to have parted with all that was valuable in his former principles, and of course of being an apostate, having discovered that the greatest of thieves are not thieves at all, (that is, if they are pious), and that slavery, though "inconsistent with the bible," is not an immoral institution—to the pious. Creating a distinction between pious thieves and impious thieves. But here is the secret of this. Several great D. D.'s in Europe and America, but especially at Princeton, have made the same discovery, viz: that slaveholding is either no sin at all, or so small a one as should not exclude its perpetrator from the church. They seem to have lost sight of the fact, that one of the mysteries of iniquity, distinguishing the Mother of Harlots was, that her sons, if they paid well for the privilege, might perpetrate any number of frauds during life, with her full sanction, when, if any one else were caught at it, he was considered a fit subject for the tender mercies of the Inquisition, with the agreeable prospect before him of being both hanged and damned, with all convenient dispatch. The American Church is with them in this. A member of it can practice the greatest of all frauds upon his brother in the Church, and still, provided he pays the preacher and is liberal to the Missionary Board, be caressed as one whom "it would be a great mistake to call a thief." What a pity he had not dis-

covered the difference between a *sinful system*, and the acts of *participants under the system*; before he helped pass the following resolution, at the formation of the Highland county Anti Slavery Society, of which he was Corresponding Sec., Aug. 1, '36:

Resolved, That we cannot agree with those who profess to be opposed to slavery in the abstract, and who at the same time can find many excuses for slavery in practice, because in our view, the whole evil of slavery consists in the practice of it, the discontinuance of which would be a complete removal of the evil.

"Another consideration," continues he, "they [the slaveholders] are not conscious of the evil of slavery—have not examined the subject—are mere babes in Christ." Who can for a moment doubt it? A large family of these "babes" were at the last Gen'l Assembly. One of them was W. Bullock of Ky., president of the mob meeting which shipped off C. M. Clay's press to Cincinnati. Another "babe" who figured largely at the Assembly, and whose works on Romanism were hawked with great unction, at the door of their place of meeting, (J. H. Thornwell of S. C.) once advocated the following resolutions at an indignation meeting in the South:

Resolved, That slavery as it exists at the south is no evil, is consistent with the principles of revealed religion, and ALL opposition to it arises from a misguided and fanatical fanaticism, which we are bound to resist on the very threshold.

Resolved, That ALL interference with this subject, by fanatics, is a violation of our civil and social rights—is unchristian and inhuman, leading necessarily to anarchy and bloodshed, and that the instigators are murderers and assassins.

If they go on at this rate when they are "babes," what will they do when they become men? Such "babes" would be better for the rod of discipline.

The preacher then brings John Newton forward to prove that men thieves may steal ship-loads of slaves from Africa, and yet be pious, and therefore not amenable to church censure. No justification was attempted of him in preference to any other kidnapper, only he was pious. This justification, like one already noticed, was not original. His Holiness, the Pope, practised upon it before Mr. S. was thought of. Had Newton lived in our day, and been caught by John Bull, at his pious trade, his cloth would not have saved him from being hanged as a pirate.—And even Henry A. Wise would have said amen! "But," asks our preacher in triumph, "was John Newton ever expelled from the church?" No, nor does the church he belonged to expel its members for sins which Mr. S. (correctly enough, as it respects most of them,) believes of giant magnitude, but this only enhances the enormity of slavery, for most of them are inseparably connected with it. They are as follows: Dancing, profaneness, theatre-going, horse racing, card playing, drunkenness and debauchery. For none of these would it expel, but he would expel, although many consider one of them as either no sin at all, or at least quite a venial one; and none of them are at all equal to slavery in enormity. Is it any wonder then that they did not expel Newton?" But are we to imitate them, is the question. "No," says Mr. S., not as it respects the dancer, &c., but merely the slaveholder. And why not he as well as the others? "O you might expel somebody that was pious." If Newton was indeed pious, the best evidence he gave of the fact, was his repentance and abandonment of what Mr. S. calls the "accursed slave trade," not his active participation in it. But if we are to believe the latter, the churches should hold on to him, whether he abandons his business or not. Tell it not in Richmond, publish it not in the streets of New Orleans, that here is a church so corrupt that she will hold on to a member up to the very day that the government hangs him for his misdeeds. Poor Judas slew himself too soon, for had he been a co-member with such men as Rice, Junkin and Steel, he would have been fellowshiped as a tender "babe in Christ!" No doubt he appeared quite pious, as his fellow disciples seem not to have suspected him; and even he, like the slaveholder, was the last to suspect himself of treason against God and man. Judas sold his master for thirty pieces of silver, but his successors of the O. S. Presbyterian Church make a much better bargain, and sell him for three or four hundred dollars—not in his own person, but in that of his members—60,000 of whom they hold in their pious keeping.—

But still don't expel Judas, altho' by retaining him, you thereby jeopard your own standing: for a man is known by the company he keeps.

He next told us of a "resolution recently passed by the Synod of Cincinnati, declaring slaveholders, under certain circumstances, not necessarily sinners, and that Father Dickey was the first to vote for it." We know not the nature of these resolutions, but suppose they refer to circumstances which are insufficient foundation on which to build a support of slavery. We are glad to hear him quote the good man with approbation, but are sorry he did not extend his approbation further; and it was well for him that he did not. For Father D. has the temerity to differ with the great D. D.'s and the little D. D.'s in his interpretation of 1 Tim. 6: 1, 2. Mr. D. thinks that the servant mentioned in the 2nd verse was free, his master having become a believer. That the apostle's advice to labor for his master implies that his compliance was optional. That "believing master," means *repentant slaveholders*, and the master being a brother and an honest man, and *partaker of the benefit of his labor*, and not proprietor of his body, soul, wife, children, and all his and their earnings, would, of course, give unto him that which was just and equal &c. Knowing these to be Mr. D.'s sentiments, how dishonest to take advantage of a quibble, to convert an aged abolitionist into the unwitting apologist of the whole accursed slave system.

He next gave us the reasoning of Drs. Bacon, Beecher, Stow and others of the Board of Missions. One thought "slavery the greatest sin in the nation." Another thought it the "greatest abomination on the face of the earth." But notwithstanding its bad character, and as if to make amends for this abuse, they all agreed that it should remain in the church, being the *sin of the body politic*, and not of the individual. (Wonder what will become of the individual when God destroys the body politic?) But ask: Have any of the scribes believed on Him? by quoting the opinions of D. D.'s against church purification. We could not see, unless the great comfort derived by the speaker, from being able to take shelter under their saintly wings. That the slaveholders are deeply indebted to them is no doubt true. That they seem to consider them their body guard is equally true. And that such recreants, by prostituting their powers to the business of degrading the church to the level of the Whore of Rome, do more toward filling the land with infidels, than all the avowed infidels in it, is truer than all. But their opinion is to weigh down that of Scripture and common sense, we are not so ready to admit, especially as they are arrayed, with a few, and a very few, honorable exceptions, against every salutary reform that blesses our age and nation until they become popular.

His next labor was to prove that "members are not responsible for the sins of the church, and that abolitionists had wrong views of responsibility. All we have to do is to bear testimony against what we find in the church." This he attempted to prove, by referring to the seven churches of Asia. Now, it seems to us, those churches were held responsible for the views they tolerated. The Balaamites and the Jezabels were commanded to be excluded, or the churches would be fearfully scourged, and the guilty members cast upon beds of death, &c. This looks like responsibility. Bear testimony, forsooth! But those whose lips are sealed do not do this, or if they do, their testimony is like the lectures of one Eli of old—"few and far between." Let them beware lest his fate, which is the best commentary upon his policy, becomes their own. He, it will be recollected, had his neck broken. And if the necks of all the unfaithful Eli's throughout the land were broken, it would occasion a wailing equal to that of Egypt.

He then insinuates that "our attack on the pro-slavery clergy and churches is done in league with infidels." An infidel society in N. Y. had determined to join the Abolitionists, and abuse the clergy and churches, as the best way to put down Christianity. Now, admitting the truth of this statement, which we by no means do, it is an entire mistake to suppose that such proceedings tend to the growth of infidelity. What tends to this, is the corruption of the churches themselves. These, together with the scandalous lives of

the clergy, are and always have been, as has been already intimated, the hot beds of infidelity, where they multiply with the prolific readiness of the maggot. We here see the sanctuary and the sacred office prostituted, for the purpose of pandering to slavery, by flattery the oppressor of God's poor, because said oppressor is rich and powerful. And what is the request with which our ears are saluted? It is that we should turn traitors to the truth, and connive for his special accommodation, at his lording it over God's heritage, lest we be branded as infidels! How very reasonable. As then the clergy, themselves, are a fruitful source of infidelity, and not we, if they wish to prevent its spread, let them cease calling evil good, and good evil—putting darkness for light, and light for darkness—then will infidelity be put to silence—not before. This effect will never be produced by laying the charge of its spread at the door of Abolitionists. If the N. Y. Infidels have taken the step in question, they might have saved themselves the trouble.—They need be under no apprehension for the success of their enterprise—need join no new party. The work is doing to their hands, by such men as Junkin, Rice, Graham and Steel. Nothing is wanting but to prove that such an institution as slavery is sanctioned by the bible, and should not only be tolerated in the churches, but it is not even immoral, and the work is done: infidelity is triumphant and our country is ruined.

He next undertakes to prove, that "with the duties of church members, as citizens, the pulpit has very little to do. With such things as slavery, in the District of Columbia, he would not meddle, &c." This seems to be a very general conclusion, with the clergy, of a certain stamp, when the subject of slavery presses upon them. The infernal trade in slaves, carried on in the District, moves not their petrified souls. No emolument is to be derived from its condemnation. Whenever anything of this sort is in the wind, they immediately prick up their ears, in an attitude of attention, as we are exemplified in the case of those 13 or 14 clergymen of different denominations, who ran on a recent occasion, for the office of Chaplain to Congress, at which time they dogged the members, for their votes, with the usual tricks of electioneering demagogues. Here was something in the District, with which they could "meddle." Wonder what the New York Infidel Club would say to it? There are transactions of a nature, that he must have a hard heart, indeed, who would not be disposed to "meddle" therewith. And the following is one of them. A narrative calculated to move the sympathies of any body, but a shuffling priest, who is waiting for a bid on his prayers at a price per diem. It was the sale, in the District, during the past winter of the wife, children, and grand children, (13 in all,) of a free colored man, a member of the M. E. Church, of more than 30 years standing, in which pious Christians were the chief actors. The Pulpit, you know, must have nothing to do with slavery, in the District—that would be meddling with politics—a thing it is never right to do against slavery—it must only be done for it. And in meddling with politics for slavery, it is considered lawful for the "pulpit" to thrust forward its occupant as chaplain at political conventions, got up to promote the election to the Presidency of a Slaveholder, Duellist, Gambler, &c., &c. Such "meddling" as that is very excusable, in the "pulpit," especially as a majority of its supporters, like the Israelites when they wished a King, were as piously bent on the measure itself. And then don't all the D. D.'s tell us, by their example, that it is always proper to float with the popular current? Certainly. How then can the clergy be expected to "meddle" with this "exciting subject" in its relations to the District of Columbia. Why that would be all on as preaching politics on Sunday, and would at once sink them to a level with Alvan Stewart and Gerrit Smith. O dear!!—And then you know, slavery, in the District, is an organic sin, about which individuals need not be troubled.

Next he brings a string of charges against late members of his own congregation, "who have studied the slavery question so much and so exclusively, that, like the Millerites, they are in danger of becoming monomaniacs. Their personal piety is withering away, having forsaken the Sabbath school, and Missionary cause, and all other means of grace—have thrown aside those old stan-

dard works, such as those of Doddridge, Baxter, &c., and scarcely read the bible, while such works as the *Brotherhood of Thieves* occupy their place—he actually saw a copy of it on one of their tables, but did not read it (how then does he know it to be objectionable?) and," as if to cap the climax of wickedness, "they rejoice more to hear of the escape of 50 slaves to Canada, than they would to hear of that number being converted." Of course when they run away they leave the means of grace behind them. Let us hear the slaveholder's own account of the matter. The New Orleans Presbytery say that there are 100,000 slaves within their single bounds—75,000 of these never hear the gospel—20,000 hear it but seldom—5,000 only hear it anything like steadily (and that from slaveholders.) This is the flattering prospect of the slave's conversion in the South, itself being Judge. Why then should we wish him to remain there for that object? Conversion, then, even to the Slaveholders' Religion, is exceedingly rare, and a chance to search the scriptures (which might be supposed necessary;) still more so, as the instance of the bible distributor, who narrowly escaped the Penitentiary, in a recent case, for giving a bible to a slave, abundantly testifies. What vast spiritual privileges, then, they loose by running to Canada. What their chance for conversion is there, we know not, but are so sanguine as to suppose, it cannot be much worse than it was in the South, a section decidedly in the rear of Algiers, in point of morals and civilization. But be these religious privileges what they may, their mental culture, at least, is cared for. For who but the recreant priests of the times, have failed to hear of a certain Seminary of learning taught by Hiram Wilson, for the fugitives' especial benefit, where it is reasonable to suppose their spiritual welfare is looked after, with quite as much solicitude as it would be on a Louisiana sugar plantation. Mr. S. is so zealous in the Missionary cause he ought to send him a box of clothing. But before it starts it is but fair to tell him that it will sustain a very different class of men from Professors Stuart and Hodge, and the Rev. C. C. Jones of S. C., and who do not touch with these men, that Paul sent back Onesimus, to his master, a slave for life. Those who are so horrified at seeing or hearing of the escape of slaves to Canada, seem unfortunately to have gotten on the wrong side of the Ohio river, and in order to help convert said chattles, instead of aiding their escape from the infernal horrors of the Southern prison house, had better return to the land of chains and whips.

That any of us have forsaken the Sabbath school, either on account of our Abolition sentiments, or our want of personal piety, is a supposition quite gratuitous, on his part. Of our personal piety, it becomes us not to speak. We trust we are too pious to rob a cradle, or plunder a trundle bed, or even to apologize for those who would. The charge that "we have neglected other means of grace," is destitute of truth, as also that we have thrown aside the standard works named. We even retain and read the old *Confession of Faith*, having the note still in it that was expunged by the Gen'l Assembly of 1816, to prevent slaveholding church members from seeing, as in a glass, that they were *men-stealers*, when they read the 8th commandment, with the scripture proofs. Wonder if Mr. S. keeps this old edition on his table? We have reason to fear that such works as those of Rice and Junkin have usurped its place. For he has renounced the doctrine taught in the note alluded to, that "bringing off slaves or free-men and to keep, sell, or buy them (constitutes) stealers of men." We obtained several good works before the Presbyterian church had commenced the business of *forgery*, by mutilating whatever might speak unfavorably of the (moral) institution of slavery. Were we now to purchase, we would be particularly careful that none of these counterfeiters extraordinary had any hand in their publication. And this is just what our purblind preachers call laying aside of standard works on piety. The sneaking act of expunging from one of our missionary hymns, in a late edition of the Assembly's Psalms and Hymns, a couple of verses, apparently because they smelled a little too strong of Abolition, had put us on our guard. No wonder persons who associate with such company, should feel horror-struck at the bare sight of the "Brotherhood of Thieves,"

and should drop it like hot iron, as soon as it was identified. Persons of lax morals often tremble and turn pale at the bare mention of a whipping post, or pair of stocks, the disagreeable associations being too strong for their nerves.

But we have "forsaken the Missionary cause." In answer let it be said we have not, nor will we support those Mission Boards, who send out panders to the slaveholder, to preach a gospel that would enslave the world. We will support those missionaries who preach glad tidings indeed, and liberty instead of chains to the captive—who repudiate caste in their own country, before they go across the wide Atlantic to denounce it among the Hindoos. And this is called forsaking the Missionary cause. But then our "personal piety is withering." We rather think it has never appeared very green and flourishing, to those petrifications in the shape of men, whose flinty souls can sympathize with the extortioner and stoop to flatter him in the piety which enables him to oppress the peeled slave. Nor are we desirous it should. "We unto you when (such) men speak well of you, for so spake they of the false prophets."

As to the charge of monomania, we regret to see professed ministers of the gospel descend to the petty tricks and slander of the demagogue, to sustain even a sinking cause. What evidence have we given that we are monomaniacs? Have we been dancing around tall ash poles with dead and live coons, banners, flags, and grotesque imagery of giraffes, and gerymanders, like others of his congregation? If we had, we would admit that if we were not monomaniacs, we were in a fair way to become lunatics, in which case we should have had his prayers instead of his disapprobation. The whole of this tirade is quite a masterpiece of policy. But like the rest of his sermon, it is not new. The most noble Festus resorted to the like honorable trick. The Pharisees also did the same. "He hath a devil and is mad, why hear ye him?" If the advocates for perpetual slavery, in the church, could induce the belief that we had become monomaniacs, by too much study of a "fiendish fanaticism," it might possibly frighten their followers from the abolition heresy, and perhaps save them from monomania. It will, no doubt, be gratifying to know that, from the peculiar structure of some people's brain, or some other cause that indisposes them to hard study, there is but little danger of their being afflicted with the disease. The design of such attacks is obvious. It is always to make a low appeal to the prejudices of the multitude, and thereby to save a vast amount of argument. After all it is important testimony in our favor. It is a proclamation to the world that such is our zeal and faithfulness in the cause of emancipation, that we are thought worthy to receive the brand of mad men or fanatics. Such charges have been rife in other times and in other countries. They were brought against Clarkson, against Wilberforce, against Buxton and their glorious compeers, around whose names, a protracted life of devotion to the cause of the slave, has cast a halo of such effulgence that the gibes and sneers of the servile tools of despotism, have never been able to becloud or obscure it. We feel too much honored to be vilified, in the same manner of these apostles of liberty and religion. While, at the same time, we cannot but rejoice, and would be very far from exchanging this testimony, indirect though it be, and not intended to be passed to our credit, for the ephemeral applause of the despot, and for permission to follow, at an humble distance, in the rear of the pro-slavery D. D. of this land.

His practical improvement was introduced somehow thus: "How much more good these ultra men might do, did they but attend to the duties of religion, and let the question of slavery have its proper place, and surely the care of the soul is of much more importance than the liberty of the body." The care of the soul, we admit, is of paramount importance. But such truisms uttered with mock solemnity, by one who is using his religious and ministerial influence, to quarter, upon the church, a membership who deny to fifty thousand of her own slaves, all knowledge of letters, and consequently all opportunity to read, for themselves, in the Word of Life of what concerns their souls, are but calculated to inspire the belief, that he who utters them is an incompetent judge of what is likely to benefit the soul. No doubt if we would leave this discussion entirely to the slaveholders, and their clerical apologists, it would be a source of no little consolation to the worthies in question. The slave would have little to do but work, and eat his peck of corn per week. And the abolitionist—we can hardly tell what would be his happy lot. We have, however, a few objections to complying with this kind advice. First, it is our opinion, that it is an important part of religious duty, to love our neighbor as

ourselves, a compliance with which requires that we plead the cause of the poor and needy, and consequently, that we have much more correct views of this matter than our adviser. Again, all history convinces us that both our civil and religious rights, are better secured when we ourselves watch them, with sleepless vigilance, than when we entrust that duty to others. God takes care of those who take care of themselves, is much sounder practical theology than that given in the ghostly advice before us. And then, to tell the plain truth, we have not the most unbounded confidence in the adviser's honesty in such matters. His shuffling policy and retrograde course, of late years, have caused us to look elsewhere for wise counsel in all matters that concern the soul.

W. KEYS.

FREE PRODUCE.

As the subject of abstaining from the products of slave labor is engaging the attention of Abolitionists at the present time, I will offer a few remarks upon it. I am aware that it is a subject that is susceptible of close reasoning on either side, and upon which many nice distinctions have been made, and much sophistry and fallacious reasoning expended; yet I think that if we were all to investigate the various ramifications of the system of slavery that exists in the United States, and the relation that we sustain to it, with a desire to discover the "truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth," let it cut where it will, we might arrive at the same conclusion or nearly so.

I take the position that whoever uses the products of the slave's toil, sustains slavery, and if there is any guilt attached to human actions, that individual is guilty. What is slavery? Is it not compelling an individual to labor for another without compensation? And what is the slaveholder's object in compelling his fellow man thus to labor? That he may use the products of that labor for his own aggrandizement. But if he could not dispose of his products, he could not sustain the system: hence all who purchase or consume slave labor produce, are upholding slavery.

But says one, "Slavery is a tremendous evil, that has become combined with every department of society, and a component part of all our institutions, and consequently will require a vast amount of labor for its overthrow. Now if I can get slave labor goods fifty per cent. cheaper than free goods; if I can get a yard of muslin for 25 cents, whereas I would have to give 50 cents for one of linen, I can use the other quarter towards destroying slavery; and thus convert the using of slave labor goods into an instrument for its destruction. Hence I can use the products of the slave's toil and be perfectly consistent." Now this same individual will tell you that it is wrong to remain a member of the Methodist Episcopal, or any other pro-slavery church, though you may be converting its members to abolitionism by scores: because you are fellowshiping and upholding a church that sustains slavery, and are in a pro-slavery position, although you are doing infinitely more towards destroying the hideous monster than upholding it; yet you must "do no evil," and it is your duty to come out from it. You must not do evil that good may come, you must "do justice tho' the heavens fall." Yet you may purchase of the slaveholder the fruits of the slave's toil, which he has wrung from him by means of the torturing lash, thereby enabling him to sustain his villainous system; in order that you may have a little more time and money to expend in combatting it.

What cares the slaveholder for my opposition to slavery, while I am giving him the means of sustaining it? What cares the M. E. Church for my opposition to its pro-slavery position, while I am sustaining it in that position? What cares the band of horse thieves for my opposition to their stealing, while I am purchasing their stolen horses? No matter if I can purchase their horses fifty per cent. cheaper than others, and thus "have more time and money to expend" in abolishing the evil of horse-stealing, my influence will be neutralized in the support I give them; they will say I am not in earnest. No matter if I can have a greater influence by being a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church—I am shielding slavery by my position, and my influence will be of but little effect. No matter if by using the products of the slave's unrequited toil, I can "have more time and money to expend" in combatting the monster, I am giving the slaveholder the means of maintaining his system, and he will say my opposition is not in earnest. Again—I see a man deliberately pointing a cannon loaded with shot at an assembly of people, and is about to touch it off and destroy a number of lives. Now by shooting that man with a pistol I can prevent him firing the cannon and destroying many lives. I do shoot him, and thus "convert murder into an instrument of saving life." Would I be justifiable in

committing murder for such a purpose? I apprehend the county sheriff would be ordered to commit a second murder upon me in consequence of it.

But some say if they were in the slave's condition, they would be willing that those who were laboring for their redemption should use the products of their toil. That would depend on circumstances. If I were in slavery I would be willing that those who were using their efforts for my emancipation should use the products of my labor, provided I could bestow it without my master's being benefited by it. But if while they were thus laboring, they were purchasing the fruits of my toil from my master, thus enabling him to keep his iron heel of oppression on my neck, I should most certainly consider that though they might sincerely wish my freedom, yet they were very much mistaken in the means they were using to obtain it.

This is a nation of slaveholders. They are not confined to the southern states, but are here among us and throughout the country. If we sincerely desire to abolish slavery, we must show them that we are in earnest. How are we to show them that we are in earnest? We do not intend to fight them. We think that would be bad policy; not only bad policy, but wrong; and we must do no evil, not even that good may come. How then must we do it? Preach repentance to the people and exert our moral powers! Our preaching will be of no avail while our actions give the lie to it; and while our actions belie our preaching we shall have no moral power.

My friends, I would say that to show this slaveholding nation that we earnestly desire the abolition of slavery, we must cease to have any connection with the system whatever, except where stern necessity compels. We must quit using the products of the slave's labor. We must discontinue our connection with the church and with the state, so far as they uphold slavery. Then can we preach repentance and the opening of the prison doors, with a clear conscience. Then can we have a moral power sufficient to "grasp the earth by either pole and shake it to its centre." Then our own hands will be clear of our brother's blood, and we shall be using the means, which, if carried out, will cause the Negro that pants beneath a vertical sun—the shuddering tenant of the frigid zone—the pale-faced inhabitant of the more temperate parts of the earth—the Indian that roams the forest in nature's wildest freedom—~~to stand up side by side, upon one common platform, and in one common brotherhood, and liberty and justice shall reign throughout all the earth.~~ J. M.

Salem, April 29, 1846.

FRIENDS EDITORS:—

I wish to notice briefly the communication of B. B. D. in the Bugle of March 3d. I confess I am much puzzled to come at my friend's meaning in some particulars. When I suppose he will admit that wrong exists in the Society of Friends which it takes no measures to remove, he denies it. When the wrong is proved, even from his own admissions, he assents to it—acknowledges that the Society is justly chargeable with certain errors—that it is not perfectly moral and christian; but that he knows the Society is taking measures to remove these errors. I have no disposition to trifle with the matter, and I hope B. B. D. has not. When I say that the Society takes no measures to remove certain evils, I do not mean that no word is ever spoken by any member against them, or that no principle is ever recognized by the body, which, if carried out, would operate against them. I spoke, as my friend very well knew, of special measures—such as the Society adopts towards the act of marrying contrary to order, and such as it declares to be its duty to adopt, for the removal of every thing that is wrong. In this, all, I believe, will admit I was correct.

B. B. D. thinks I cannot find many who will agree with me in the position that the members of the Society of Friends are necessarily responsible for the acts of the body. I admit that but few will agree with me here. Most persons are like himself, so situated that to admit this, would be to condemn themselves; and we are apt to be blind to our own faults. He refers to an Address issued some time ago by a committee of Anti-Slavery Friends held at Marlborough, Chester county, Pennsylvania, and represents it as taking the same ground that he has laid down. If this were true, it would be but the testimony of interested witnesses, who, if they condemned his positions, would necessarily condemn themselves at the same time. But, if I am not altogether mistaken, my friend does great injustice to those who adopted that Address, when he represents them as taking the same ground with him. I know not from his language whether he means to say, that the address corroborates all his main positions, or merely the one relating to the responsibility of members for the actions of

the body. The Address in the main, takes the same positions which I have endeavored to establish. It makes, and sustains, among others, nearly every charge against the Society which was contained in the communication to Salem Monthly Meeting, which gave rise to this discussion, and to which my friend has made so many objections; and it places those who adopted it in precisely the same position relative to the Society, which that communication places me. Like my communication, it charges the Society with immorality and corruption—with endeavoring to keep back the car of reform—with occupying a position at war with Christianity;—and it proves these charges. I disclaimed in my address to the Monthly Meeting, all connection with the Society of Friends as a christian body. Those who issued the Address referred to, do the same. They wholly deny its character as a Christian church and repudiate its authority as such. After having done this, the Address informs us that many of those who adopted it feel clear of undue responsibility, and think that they can, with this understanding, act to some extent in the Society. Has B. B. Davis fulfilled the conditions which the Marlborough Address holds to be indispensably necessary on the part of those who would remain in the Society of Friends without incurring guilt? Will he come out publicly and disclaim all Christian fellowship and connection with the Society? When he does so it will be fair for him to refer to the Marlborough Address, as so far agreeing with him; and not till then. He will also find if he does this that his position in the Society, if not towards it, will be essentially changed; as he will hold fewer offices than at present. I do not believe that those who issued the Address referred to, are yet altogether clear of responsibility. But I think their position a less culpable one than that occupied by B. B. D.

My friend while in his present position may labor to clear himself of responsibility; but it is in vain. He has, as yet, attempted no reply to my argument on this subject except to say that my illustration was not a fair one. In my last I so changed the illustration that no one can deny its applicability—but he makes no reply. This case is too clear to need argument. We are not to ask whether an individual knows an act to be wrong, when he asks us to join him in it—whether in our judgment it is wrong.—B. B. D. would no sooner countenance slavery among honest slaveholders than among dishonest ones. The Society of Friends professes to deal with such of its members as do wrong, and if it cannot make them sensible of their error to disown them. The very reason which my friend gives for not disowning the Society of Friends, is the one urged in most cases by the Society for disowning erring members. B. B. Davis the man, is therefore a very different person from B. B. Davis the overseer. As a man he fellowships the wrongdoer, because he cannot make him sensible that he is doing wrong; as an overseer he holds it to be "an indispensable" duty to disfellowship him—for the same reason—and acts accordingly!

B. B. D. misrepresents me when he says I assert that the anti-abolition Friends know that they are opposing real reforms. No such assertion was made. I clearly stated that they denied this, and admitted that they are, many of them, as sincere in their course as Paul was in his persecutions of the christians. Will my friend dare to say that they are more sincere or more excusable than Paul? B. B. D. will find an answer to what he says of "progress" in the Society of Friends, in the Marlborough Address, published in No. 16 of the Bugle, to which I beg leave to refer him, and our readers generally.

There are other points in B. B. D.'s communication which I would gladly notice, but our articles have heretofore been too long, and I feel like reforming in this particular as well as others.

J. BARNABY, JR.

THE OREGON NOTICE.

This matter is at last disposed of in Congress. The amendments of the Senate were substantially agreed to by the House. They place the responsibility of giving the notice upon the President of the United States, and are favorable to continued negotiation with the British Government. The war party have found themselves in a lean minority.—Messrs. Allen, Hannegan and Cass are *hors combat*. The signature of the President to the bill proves that the course of these gentlemen was more rash than wise.

We rejoice at the result, for a greater calamity could not befall us than a war with England provoked by our own action. To the Senate is due the entire credit of saving the country from the disgrace of measures hazarding not only the peace but the honor of the country. If measures equally efficacious could be taken to check the rashness of the executive in regard to Mexico, we should be spared much of the odium that will otherwise attach to us among the nations of the earth, for a controversy with a government too weak to redress itself.—*Am. Citizen*.

Dr. Wilson, a Catholic clergyman, says that during the seven years that he resided in Rome, he never saw a drunken man.

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

SALEM, MAY 3, 1846.

"I love agitation when there is cause for it—the alarm bell which startles the inhabitants of a city, saves them from being burned in their beds."—*Edmund Burke*.

Persons having business connected with the paper, will please call on James Barnaby, corner of Main and Chestnut sts.

ANNIVERSARY NOTICE.

The Ohio Am. A. S. Society will hold its Annual Meeting at New Garden, Col. Co., commencing on the 17th of June, at 10 o'clock, A. M.

Arrangements are being made for the attendance of prominent advocates of the oppressed, not only of our own, but other states; the result of which, with other particulars, will be made known previous to the meeting.

From the increasing interest in this state we anticipate a GENERAL RALLY. We also invite our friends of Western Pennsylvania, and Eastern Indiana to be with us on that occasion, and aid in devising efficient plans of operation for the coming year.

By order of the Ex. Com. of the O. A. A. S. Society.

LOT HOLMES,

Rec. Secretary.

Our thanks to Messrs. Giddings and Tilden for Congressional Documents.

IS THE SLAVEHOLDER A CHRISTIAN?

Wm. Henry Brisbane, better known as Dr. Brisbane, the reformed slaveholder, has been appointed to the editorial charge of the American Citizen at Philadelphia. Much as we respect him for the sacrifices he has made in the anti-slavery cause, freely laying his patrimony upon the altar of emancipation, and showing to the world that a man who has had slavery entailed upon him need not necessarily remain a slaveholder, yet we are not blind to his inconsistencies, nor will we refrain from freely commenting upon the doctrines he advances. In the last No. of the Citizen—the first which has been issued under his supervision, he defines his position, 1st, politically; 2nd, religiously. As the Citizen is a Liberty party paper, he of course occupies the political ground of that party; in regard to this we have nothing now to say, but wish to call the attention of our readers to the singular views which he advocates in the latter part of the article referred to. He says:

"As regards slavery morally and religiously, no one can have a deeper sense of the turpitude of the whole system; no one would go farther than myself in all honorable measures to have it abolished. Yet I am not among those who believe that all slaveholders are necessarily shut out from all communion with God, and are regarded by the Almighty as out of the pale of Christ's church. I sincerely believe I was as certainly a christian when I was a slaveholder and advocating slavery as I am now. I have no reason from my own experience, nor from my association with slaveholders, when a slaveholder myself and since I have been an abolitionist, to deny the sincere piety of many slaveholders of my acquaintance. Still I do not believe it right to hold church connection with slaveholders. Theirs may be a sin of ignorance, but it is no less a sin on that account, to hold men in abject slavery; and with our light we cannot have the plea of ignorance to justify us in holding fellowship with those who are sustaining, although it may be in ignorance, such a wicked system of oppression and wrong. We must not for the sake of courtesy or personal friendships, hold such relations as to give sanction to what we feel to be crime.

"Finally, I cannot concur with those who would wage an exterminating warfare against the churches. I have no connection myself, personally with any church that has connection either directly or indirectly with any slaveholding body. But I am entirely unwilling to take any ground to bind the consciences of others in regard to this matter. I must leave every man to his own conscience, what shall be his ecclesiastical connections: it is between him and his God. I have my own religious views, and I wish to tolerate even that religion which I least of all approve. I must leave the conscience free to act out its own convictions of duty in all cases whatsoever."

We "are not among those who believe that all slaveholders are necessarily shut out from all communion with God," for we are not believers in the doctrine of total depravity, and therefore have we faith to believe that the moral nature of all men can be reached by the Spirit of Truth, and brought into harmony with it; but our ideas of the church of Christ must change very much before we can believe that any one who claims his brother as property can be a member of it. We do not so much look to the profession of a man to know whether he is a christian or an infidel, as to his belief, which men always write out in their actions, whatever they may profess. Hence we come to the conclusion that "in every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." If a slaveholder can fear God and work righteousness while he makes merchandise of God's image, then and not otherwise may he be a member of the church of Christ. Does the slaveholder fear God? that is, does he fear to offend him, to violate his laws, to do

injustice to any of his little ones? The worshippers of Juggernaut, the religious Persian, and the devout Mahomedan all fear the God they respectively worship, and so may the slaveholder, but his God is not the christian's God. However sincere may be the worshippers of a false God, their sincerity does not entitle them to membership in the church of Christ. The slaveholder may be sincere in his purpose, devout in his worship, and in the relation he sustains to others than his slaves, be all a christian could be, yet if he offends in the single point of slaveholding, he is guilty of a breach of the whole law, and does not therefore practically, and in a true sense, fear the christian's God and work righteousness.

If Dr. Brisbane was as certainly a christian when he was a slaveholder and an advocate of slavery as he is now, we are unable to comprehend by what process of reasoning he came to the conclusion that slavery was a sin. We always thought the more nearly a man lived to the Divine law, the more certainly was he a christian; but according to the Dr.'s system of ethics a man may be a christian, who intentionally commits the greatest of all crimes; and then, when the spirit of God meets him in the highway, shows him the sinfulness of his course, and converts him to that truth which alike makes free the master and the slave, he is not more certainly a christian than he was before. According to this doctrine, if Paul was a christian when from Mars Hill he preached to the people of Athens the Unknown God whom they ignorantly worshipped, he was as certainly a christian when he persecuted the followers of Jesus unto death, verily believing he was doing God service. The worshippers of Buddha, the disciples of Confucius, the defenders of the Shaster, the believers in the Koran, are, if the Dr.'s position be true, most excellent christians, if they are but sincere and pious, which is undoubtedly the case with many of them. That he will not be satisfied with this conclusion which is legitimately deduced from his premises, we are well aware; and his sense of moral right is too strong to allow him to be satisfied with the premises themselves, if we may judge from his opinion in relation to fellowshipping these christian slaveholders, for he declares it is wrong to hold church connection with them; and that he has no connection himself, either directly or indirectly, with any slaveholding body. The Dr.'s profession is, that a man who is a slaveholder is as certainly a christian as though he were not a dealer in human flesh and blood; his belief, as manifested by his actions, is, that slaveholding is such a heinous sin, that a man who is guilty of it, whether ignorantly or intelligently, is so anti-christian that he will not hold church fellowship with him. If the slaveholder is a christian, and if the Dr. believes it right to hold church fellowship with christians, by what authority, we inquire, does he refuse to fellowship the slaveholder because he is one?

Here is a man of the same faith and order as himself, with whom he has often held church communion. The man becomes a slaveholder, and the Dr. refuses longer to give him the right hand of fellowship. "What have I done that you should treat me thus?" asks the slaveholding brother. "You have become a slaveholder," is the reply. "But am I not as certainly a christian now that I advocate and practice slavery, as I was before?" "Just as certainly," responds the Dr., "and although I recognize you as a christian, as one within the pale of Christ's church and enjoying communion with God, yet I cannot hold church fellowship with you, as that would be sanctioning what I believe to be crime." This is the Dr.'s position, and we think an intelligent slaveholder would feel that his understanding had been insulted by it. When we deny to the slaveholder the character of christian, he can readily comprehend why we refuse to fellowship him as such; but if we maintain that he is as certainly a christian while holding slaves as he would be if he freed them, and yet refuse him the fellowship we would freely extend if he were to emancipate them, he might well declare us unreasonable and fanatic. If the Dr. can reconcile this inconsistency, he can do more than we have given him credit for.

There is another point in the extract which we wish briefly to notice—the perfect freedom which the editor thinks every man should enjoy in his ecclesiastical connections, disclaiming all wish to bind the conscience. This is right. Conscience should never be bound; but the idea conveyed by the language is wrong if we understand what that idea is. If he had said, "I shall not use any arguments to influence the consciences of others in regard to this matter," we think it would have better expressed his meaning, for such will undoubtedly be the course pursued by one who remains an editor of the American Citizen; inasmuch as the leader of Liberty party in eastern Pennsylvania stands in fellowship with the New School Presby-

terians, or did when we last heard of him, and would not therefore be very likely to sustain an editor or paper that condemned his position. Is the Dr. willing to leave to the conscience of every man, without any attempt to influence it, what shall be his political connections, which are as much a matter between him and his God as are his church relations? We think not. While he is silent in relation to the latter, he will doubtless thunder against the supporters of the Whig and Democratic parties, will use facts and arguments, persuasion and rebuke with a hope so to influence conscience that it shall give them no rest until they forsake their present political organizations and unite with Liberty party. We claim, on behalf of Whigs and Democrats, that as a matter of even-handed justice, the editor of the American Citizen shall say no more to induce men to dissolve a political connection which he believes to be wrong, than he does in favor of destroying an ecclesiastical connection which he also believes to be wrong. The religious toleration of which he speaks, is no more a universal right than is political toleration;—we like not, however, the word toleration, and suppose the idea in his mind was religious liberty. If he is so tender of the rights of conscience that he will not declare whether he believes that faithfulness to truth requires men to remain in fellowship with slaveholders, or to dissolve their ecclesiastical connection with them; by what authority does he violate the rights of conscience by urging men to sever their political connection with them? How inconsistent to wink at the sins of those who are maintaining slavery's bulwarks, and then declare it morally wrong to guard her outposts.

THE REFORMER.

The path of the reformer is not, as some appear to think, strewn with roses, and his life an easy and a pleasant one. Instead of this, there is no way more difficult to tread, no path more narrow and rugged. His life is one constant scene of battle and of conflict; and if he carries a post to day, it but shows him the more clearly the necessity of attacking another to-morrow. There is for him no truce while error exists, no rest while labor is to be done; if he ceases a moment from his toil, he stands with his arms in his hands, ready instantly to renew the conflict. Not only are his actions misunderstood and misrepresented, but his very language sounds strangely in the ears of the world. He labors to uproot the false foundation of society because it is based upon a selfish and oppressive principle, but his testimonies against it are regarded as the ravings of a fanatic. He urges all men to live in conformity with the beautiful law of love which Christ gave to his disciples as their rule of life, "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them," and this is stigmatized as ranting. He exposes the wickedness of those whom the world delights to honor, points out the corruption of religious institutions, and denounces as unjust and tyrannical an oppressive government, and this is called abuse and vituperation.

Such is what all reformers may expect in a greater or lesser degree. Those who labor at home, as well as those who labor abroad; those whose influence springs up in the midst of the fireside circle, and those who send forth the truth from the forum, or scatter it upon the wings of the press, will all bear witness to the truth of this. Vain indeed would be the expectation of the reformer, if he looked for the meed of praise from the generation on whom his labors are bestowed. He must be content to do good for the sake of doing it, with a consciousness that he will be misrepresented by some and maligned by others; and if he desires that men shall speak well of him, he must patiently wait until the seed which he has planted has become a mighty tree, then may they who assemble beneath its sheltering boughs, speak with gratitude of him who planted it.

C. North is informed that his paper has been regularly mailed to Nelson, Portage county. We will hereafter direct to Nelson Centre, and hope he will receive it. The fault, we apprehend, belongs to the Post Office Department.

COLONIZATION.—Recently a very respectable Colonization Society was formed in Johnson county, Indiana, auxiliary to the State Society. Quite a number who had heretofore been reckoned Abolitionists, became members.—Pres. Herald.

Men are sometimes greatly mistaken in their reckoning. Slaveholders are sometimes reckoned as Christians, military murderers as followers of Jesus, wine-bibbers as friends of temperance, and synagogues of Satan as churches of Christ. The fact that these "reckoned abolitionists" are favorable to the expatriation of the colored man, is to us sufficient evidence that they were not abolitionists but only "reckoned" so.

THOSE FEATHERS.

We lately received a present of two or three pounds of very nice feathers. There is nothing very remarkable in this fact, but the way they happened to be in our possession is rather curious. Stephen and Abby Foster had made an appointment at Chagrin Falls. The friends there were about making preparations to send for them, and in order that the labor and expense might not all rest on one individual, it was agreed to ascertain what each person present at the time the matter was talked of, would be willing to contribute. Several had mentioned what they would be willing to do, when a merchant by the name of Williams, a respectable man so called, and as we were informed, a member of the M. E. Church, being asked what he would give, replied "Two pounds of feathers," and another said "I'll give a quart of tar." The meeting was held; a good one it was; disappointing no doubt the expectations of sundry mobocrats. The circumstance above related was spoken of in Abby Foster's presence, who requested one of her friends to call on Williams and get the feathers.—The individual called, but Williams refused to deliver them without an order from her.—The order was given and the feathers delivered. We have them now in our possession, and shall make a very different, and much better use of them, than we suppose the donor intended to have them applied to, when he offered to furnish two pounds of feathers, and his kindred spirit kept him in countenance by the proffer of a quart of tar.

FROM WASHINGTON.—The Oregon question begins to assume a more amicable phase. The resolutions of Notice have been adopted by both Houses, and the war spirit has very much subsided. The subject has afforded a fruitful crop of valorous speeches and tremendously bold defiance from men, whose "masterly inactivity" would probably be their most distinguishing trait in time of actual warfare.

The House has appointed a Committee to inquire into the charges of peculation, &c., brought by C. J. Ingersoll against Daniel Webster in relation to his use of the "secret service fund," when Secretary of State; and another Committee to inquire as to the manner in which the former obtained the information he bases his charges upon, which—whether they be true or false—it is alleged was dishonorably procured.

We have received within a few days, communications enough for two or three numbers of our paper. Some we give this week, and such of the others as are suited to our columns shall receive due attention. We hope the length of the review of S. Steele's sermon, will not deter any one from perusing it. We have been informed that twenty of the members of the church of which he is pastor, recently separated themselves from it upon anti-slavery grounds. Thus the heaven works and the good cause progresses. Little by little the world is awakening to a perception of moral principles; first they are seen through a glass darkly, and then appear in the brightness of their own glory. The good time is coming—let every one lend his aid to speed it on.

We would suggest to our friends Barnaby and Davis, that perhaps they have said about as much upon the subject they are discussing as will be profitable at the present time. One has written more than seven, and the other nearly twelve columns; and they must bear in mind that a majority of our readers are not particularly interested in the position of the Society of Friends.

"CHRISTIAN RULERS."

The American Citizen, in reply to a question put by the Covenanter, and which was copied into our last No. under the above caption, after defining a creed to be "a form of words in which the articles of faith are comprehended," says

"The Liberty Party has no religious 'creed,' nor do they require their candidates to have any. But they do expect to select for their candidates men who fear God and regard the interests of man,—yet, without reference to the peculiar views each may entertain respecting ecclesiastical connections. If a man's political views and his practice are correct, we may well infer that his moral sentiments cannot be much out of order. Yet a man's religious 'creed' may be extremely orthodox, and his civil and political practices anything but Christian. We choose, as a political party, to judge of a man's faith by his works. If the fruit be good the tree cannot be very corrupt. We may trust those only with our confidence whose integrity is manifest in actions, not in creeds."

STATE GOVERNMENT.—It is probable that Wisconsin will soon be asking for admission as a State. The Milwaukee Sentinel says that there is a pretty unanimous vote in favor of State Government. The majority for it in Milwaukee was 861.

CINQUE, the leader of the Amistad captives has emigrated to Jamaica, says the Union Missionary. The Chivalry may hear from him some day. Who knows?—Lib.

The following communication and editorial comments thereon, we copy from the Spirit of Liberty. The former manifests a narrow and sectarian spirit, and was evidently written by one who fancies that all who reject or doubt the theological opinions which he believes, should be branded in this world as infidels, and damned in the world to come.—The latter is a manly and independent production, emanating from one who has less faith in creeds than in practical righteousness, who is unwilling to hold back what he believes should be spoken, even at the risk of offending some of his subscribers. Though disagreeing with the Editor in some of his opinions, we honor him for his independence, for the freedom with which he gives utterance to his thoughts upon all subjects which he believes it proper to discuss in his paper. WHAT DOES IT MEAN?—MR. AND MRS. FOSTER.

MR. EDITOR:—I was very much surprised at the notice which appeared in your last paper of these persons. The favorable manner in which you speak of them is calculated if not intended to open their way with all your paper has influence. And though three hours were spent by Rev. E. Smith, exposing their infidelity, and proving most clearly that they were using the anti-slavery platform for the promotion of infidel principles, not one word of all this appears in your notice. Why is this? Are you tarred with the same stick, or is Mr. Smith the friend of pro-slavery religion or a corrupt Christianity?

Mr. and Mrs. Foster profess to be preachers of pure Christianity, and in their defence against the attack of Mr. Smith, took the ground that the Christianity they preach, which is the pure religion of Jesus Christ, rejects the authority of all the Old Testament as a part of Christian Scriptures, and that the teachings of Jesus Christ are of authority, but those of the Apostles are not, except as they may agree with the teachings of Christ, but they do not always do; that the doctrine of pardon for past sins and renewal of heart through the atonement of Christ—justification by faith in Christ, is a priestly indulgence of the basest sort, got up by corrupt and wicked priests, to quiet the consciences of their people living in the vilest and basest sins, and standing directly in the way of holy living; that the world derived the same benefit from the death of Peter or Paul, it did from that of Christ; that the church in all ages had been the most corrupt body of men, and the supporter of Slavery; that all singing, public praying, going to meeting and divine worship, was wrong, and of course of the Devil, unless some wrongs come from God; that Christians, instead of wasting their time going to meetings to worship God on the Sabbath, should remain at home and work for the poor, or be circulating tracts or books through the streets and lanes of the city. All these they rejected as corruptions of Christianity. The Christianity which they preach rejects all these as the devices of wicked and corrupt priests. Mr. Smith brought them out fully and clearly on all these points, and proved most clearly that they were using the anti-slavery platform to preach what they called Christianity, but what was in fact, the rankest infidelity; and yet nothing of all this appears in your notice. Why, I inquire again, is this? Do you wish to keep the true position of Mr. and Mrs. Foster hid, and thus give them an opportunity to diffuse their poison? or were you afraid to let the anti-slavery community know that the old and true friend of the slave was still the fast friend of the Christian religion?

Information on these points will be very acceptable to many of your readers—especially to

A SUBSCRIBER. P. S. Never having been in your office, I send this through the Post Office. You may say you print a free paper; be it so, but one of your subscribers, at least, wishes to know if it be a free anti-slavery or a free infidel paper."

We give the above as it is written. Had the writer been manly enough to furnish his name, we should entertain less doubt of his being "a subscriber." We dislike being obliged to pay even two cents' postage on an insulting article, to which the writer is too discreet to affix his signature.

We did not allude to the religious views of Mr. and Mrs. Foster, because we had no inclination to do so, and thought they had a right to use their own platform to present any question. Did they profess to belong to, or present the views of, the Liberty party Abolitionists, we might be bound to disclaim any sentiment advanced by them, which the party did not endorse. As members of the Old Organization or Disunion Society, we left them to account to that Society for such principles as it saw fit to disclaim. We could no doubt have made some political capital for our own party, by endeavoring to affix the stigma of infidelity upon Mr. and Mrs. F., and through them upon the whole Disunion body which they profess to represent; and policy would seem to dictate such a course, as the Disunionists are our bitterest foes—but, widely as we differ with them, we do not believe that they are infidels, and scorn to feign such a belief.

We know that their views differ from those of the "Orthodox" Christians, but we have learned to put less trust in creeds, than in a faith shown by its works; and though our "Orthodox" friends may term us infidel for holding that Channing, the Unitarian, and Fox, and Peen, and Benezet, and many other Quakers and Unitarians, have lived and died Christians, we cannot help our belief, nevertheless.

As we understand our correspondent, he insinuates that we knew Mr. and Mrs. F. to be infidels, and wished to conceal their position, "and thus give them an opportunity to diffuse their poison," &c. This is a very to be so zealous for one who professes to be a Christian. Might we not have thought that a friend Smith had done enough toward displaying their views, and that he being more skilled in doctrinal controversy than we, it would be well to leave

the case to him. Indeed we are but lame on these "points of faith," and prefer to let those fight about them who attach paramount importance to them. We subscribe to most points of the Presbyterian doctrine—believe firmly in "election," "fore-ordination," &c., but can nevertheless perceive that some of our Methodist friends, who entertain an entirely opposite belief, are much better Christians than we are. So of Baptism—we prefer "sprinkling" to "immersion," but have known some good Christian Baptists, and better Christian Quakers, who thought all forms unnecessary—all days the Lord's.

A Subscriber must read our paper but little, or he would understand why we said what we believed to be just and true of Mr. and Mrs. Foster. We said at the close of their former as well as of their latter visit, although we disapproved their spirit and plan of operation, and thought them too sweeping and uncharitable in their denunciations, and very unkind in their attacks on the Liberty party,—we said then, and still think, that some of their lectures do great good to the Anti-Slavery cause. We did not choose to underrate them, nor to pass them by without notice, though some of their lectures were calculated to lessen our small supply of bread and butter. To this "subscriber" and others, who, to our pain, have shown so great a want of magnanimity, and of faith in the power of Truth, by finding fault with us for "countenancing" these strangers,—i. e. treating them hospitably, aiding them in procuring a place of meeting, advertising, and endeavoring to speak of them without extenuation or malice—we have only to say that we cannot see it to be right to do otherwise; and if they prefer an editor who will consult expediency, suppress what he does think, or say what he does not think, do not unto others as he would have others do unto him,—we cannot serve them, and will cheerfully give place to one who may be more supple.

Parkersburg, Wood county, Virginia, will undoubtedly go down to posterity as one of the great cities of this enlightened age.—Her fame is certainly in the ascendant, and bids fair to eclipse that of all the other important places within the circle of our 'manifest destiny.' The last great act of the powers that be in Parkersburg is thus described by the Marietta Intelligencer:—At a late meeting of the Court of Common Pleas in Parkersburg, three citizens, Rev. Benjamin Athey, Edward McPherson and Barcus Cook, were convicted of reading incendiary matter, and put under bonds to keep the peace. We understand the facts as follows:

Some two years since, a newspaper containing a dialogue, was sent to some one in Wood county, and at a wedding party, a few months ago, one of the guests read it for the amusement of the company. This dialogue the author imagines to have occurred between a demon and a ghost just arrived at Tartarus, in which the demon inquires:

Art thou that man of blood and birth
Devoid of human feeling?
The wretch I saw when last on earth
In human cattle dealing?
Ghost—'I'm from the south, the Ghost replies,
And I was there a Teacher—
Saw men in chains with laughing eyes
I was a SOUTHERN PREACHER,
And when I saw the horrid sight,
Of slaves by torture dying,
And told their Masters all was right,
I knew that I was LYING, &c.

And for this, after the above named gentlemen had satisfied the Court that they had no evil design in reading these verses, and were moreover ignorant that to recite, read or circulate, such pieces of poetry was contrary to the law of the land and the liberty of Virginia, they were only required to enter into bonds and recognizances to keep the peace in the following order: Rev. Benj. Athey, \$100 for three years; Edward McPherson, \$200, for two years; Barcus Cook \$100 for one year. After which they were dismissed with the distinct understanding that their case had been handled very leniently—but such would not be shown in another case.—Marietta Intelligencer.

The Board of General Education in Switzerland has forbidden the whole of the students in the several faculties to smoke, upon the principle that the habit is not only useless and in bad taste, but expensive, injurious to health, and at the same time dangerous to the public. Is not the example worthy of imitation?

CITY OF VORSEE.—This city, the head quarters of the new Mormon prophet, Strang, numbers already, it is said, ten thousand inhabitants. It is situated "on the prairie on White river," on the borders of Racine and Walworth counties, Wisconsin Territory, and is described as a most beautiful place, possessing an immense hydraulic power, sufficient to make it the first manufacturing place in the West.

In the days of Robert Fulton, the House of Representatives of the United States was refused him for the purpose of delivering a lecture on steam navigation, on the ground that it was a discussion of a visionary scheme.

War Expenses.—The French War department, principally for Algeria, costs this year, \$60,000,000. Costly conquest so far as money is concerned, to say nothing of human life! It is somewhat amusing that the French keep 80,000 soldiers there to protect 50,000 settlers.

An Indiana paper nominates General Samuel Houston as a candidate for the next Presidency.

MARRIED

On the 28th ult., by Friend's ceremony, at the house of Moses Buck in New Garden, ALBERT GRIFFITH to ELIZA ANN KROON.

NOTICE

Benjamin S. and J. Elizabeth Jones will hold Anti-Slavery meetings in Williamsport, Stark county, on Saturday afternoon and Sunday, the 23d and 24th insts., commencing at half-past 1 o'clock.

POETRY.

WE ARE LOWLY.

BY ROBERT NICHOL.

We are lowly—very lowly—
Misfortune is our crime;
We have been trodden under foot
From all recorded time.
A yoke upon our necks is laid,
A burden to endure;
To suffer is our legacy—
The portion of the poor!

We are lowly—very lowly,
And scorned from day to day;
Yet we have something of our own,
Power cannot take away.
By tyrants we are toiled to death—
By cold and hunger killed;
But peace is in our hearts—it speaks
Of duties all fulfilled!

We are lowly—very lowly;
Nor house nor land have we;
But there's a heritage for us
While we have eyes to see.
They cannot hide the lovely stars,
Words in Creation's book,
Although they hold their fields and lands
Corrupted by our look!

We are lowly—very lowly,
And yet the fairest flowers
That by the wayside raise their eyes,
Thank God, they still are ours!
Ours is the streamlet's mellow voice,
And ours the common dew;
We still dare gaze on hill and plain,
And field and meadow too!

We are lowly—very lowly;
But when the cheerful spring
Comes forth with flowers upon her feet,
To hear the thrush sing,
Although we dare not seek the shade
Where haunt the forest deer—
The waving leaves we still can see,
The humming birds can hear!

We are lowly—very lowly;
Our hedgerow paths are gone
Where woodbine laid their fairy hands
The hawthorn's breast upon.
Yet slender meadows still are left,
And Heaven doth endure,
And hears the prayers that upward rise
From the afflicted poor!

THE PEACE-MAKER'S BANNER.

During the discussions of the last afternoon of the session of the Peace Convention in Providence, Rev. Elanathan Davis wrote the following ode with his pencil, while in his seat and in the midst of the stirring appeals which were addressed to the audience. To our mind, it is a production worth all the expense of time, talent and labor, bestowed on our recent Convention. Nobler sentiments were never set to the tune, "God save the Queen." At the Worcester Peace Convention, to be held next week after next, we can almost promise ourselves and others the pleasure of hearing these great words of love sung by those sweet singers of our Israel, the Rogers Family.—*Christian Citizen.*

Not with the flashing steel—
Not with the cannon's peal,
Or stir of drum,
But in the bond of love;
Our white flag floats above,
Her emblem is the dove,
'Tis thus we come.

The laws of Christian light,
These are our weapons bright,
Our mighty shield;
Christ is our leader high,
And the broad plains which lie
Beneath the blessed sky,
Our battle-field.

What is that "great intent,"
On which each heart is bent,
Our hosts among?
It is that hate may die,
And war's red curse may fly,
That war's high praise for aye,
No more be sung.

That all the poor may rest,
Beneath their own vines blest,
In glorious peace;
That death and hell may yield,
And human hearts long steeled,
By love's pure drops unsealed,
From warfare cease.

On, then, in God's great name,
Let each pure spirit's flame
Burn bright and clear;
Stand firmly in your lot,
Cry ye aloud, "doubt not,"
Be ye forth forgot,
Christ leads us here.

So shall earth's distant lands,
In happy, holy bands,
One brotherhood,
Together rise and sing,
And joyful offerings bring,
And Heaven's Eternal King,
Pronounce it good.

THE WELCOME BACK.

Sweet is the hour that brings us home,
Where all will spring to meet us;
Where hands are striving as we come,
To be the first to greet us.
When thy world hath spent its frowns and wrath
And care been sorely pressing,
'Tis sweet to turn from our roving path,
And find a fire-side blessing.
Oh, joyfully dear is the homeward track,
If we are but sure of a welcome back.

We will speak out. We will be heard,
Though all earth's systems crack,
We will not bate a single word,
Nor take a letter back.
We speak the truth, and what care we
For hissing and for scorn,
While some faint gleamings we can see
Of Freedom's coming morn!

MISCELLANEOUS.

THOUGHT TRACKS.

The foot prints of Elihu Buritt's genius are seen in the following extract from his familiar "Chat with our Exchanges."

One day I was turning my anvil beneath a hot iron, busy with the thought that there was as much intellectual philosophy in my hammer as in any of the engines going in modern times, when horrible auditions, a most unearthly screaming pierced my ears. I stepped to the door, and there was the great Iron Horse. Yes, he had come, looking for all the world, like the great Dragon we read of in the Scriptures, harnessed to half a living world and just landed on the earth, where he stood braying in surprise and indignation at the base use to which he had been turned. I saw the gigantic hexipen move with a power that made the earth tremble for miles. I saw the army of human beings gliding with the velocity of the wind over the iron track, and droves of cattle travelling in their stables at the rate of twenty miles an hour towards their city slaughter house. It was wonderful. The little busy bee winged machinery of the cotton factory dwindled into insignificance before it. Monstrous beast of passage and burden! it devoured the intervening distance and wedded cities together! But for its furnace-heart and iron sinews, it was nothing but a beast, an enormous aggregation of horse power. And I went back to the forge with an unimpaired reverence for the intellectual philosophy of my hammer.

Passing along the street one afternoon, I heard a noise in an old building, as of some one puffing a pair of bellows. So without more ado, I stepped in; and there, in a corner of a room, I saw the *chef de cuere* of all the machinery that has ever been invented since the birth of Tubal Cain. In its construction, it was as simple and unassuming as a cheese-press. It went with a lever—a lever, longer, stronger, than that with which Archimedes promised to lift the world. "It is a *Printing Press*," said a boy standing by the ink-trough with a careless turban of brown paper on his head. "Printing Press," I queried musingly to myself—"A *Printing Press*! what do you print?" I asked. "Print!" said the boy, staring at me doubtfully, "why, we print thoughts." "Print thoughts!" I slowly repeated after him; and we stood looking for a moment at each other in mutual admiration, he in the absence of an idea, and I in the pursuit of one. But I looked at him the hardest, and he left another ink mark on his forehead, from a prophetic motion of his left hand to quicken his apprehension of my meaning. "Why, yes," he reiterated in a tone of forced confidence, as if passing an idea which, though having been current a hundred years, might still be counterfeited, for all he could show on the spot—"we print thoughts, to be sure!"

"But, my boy," I asked in honest soberness, "what are thoughts, how can you get hold of them to print them?" "Thoughts are what come out of people's minds," he replied. "Get hold of them, indeed! Why minds aren't nothing you can get hold of; nor thoughts either. All the minds that were ever made, wouldn't make a ball as big as your fist. Minds they say are just like air; you can't see them; they don't weigh anything. Bill Deeper, the sexton, says that a man weighs just as much when his mind has gone out of him as he did before. No, sir, all the minds that ever lived wouldn't weigh an ounce troy."

"Then how do you print thoughts?" I asked. "If minds are as thin as air, and thoughts thinner still, and make no noise, and have no substance, shade or color and are like the winds; and more than the winds are any where in a moment; sometimes in heaven, and sometimes on earth; how can you see them when caught, or show them to others?"

Ezekiel's eyes grew luminous with a new idea, and pushing his ink-roller proudly across the metallic page of his newspaper replied: "thoughts work and walk in things what makes tracks; and we take them tracks and stamp them on paper or iron, wood, stone, or what not. That is the way we print thoughts. Don't you understand?"

The pressman let go the lever, and looked interrogatively at Ezekiel, beginning at the patch on his stringless brogans and following with his eye to the top of the boy's brown paper buff cap. Ezekiel comprehended the felicity of his illustration, and wiping his hands on his tow apron, gradually assumed an attitude of earnest exposition. I gave him an encouraging wink, and so he went on:

"Thoughts make tracks," he continued impressively, as if envolving a new phrase of the idea by repeating it slowly. Seeing we assented to this proposition inquiringly, he stepped to the type case, with his eye fixed admonishingly upon us. "Thoughts make tracks," he repeated, arranging in his hand a score or two of metal slips, "and with these we can take the exact impression of every thought that ever went out of the heart of a man; and we can print it too," giving the naked form a blow of triumph with his fist—"we can print it too—give us paper and ink enough—till the great round earth is blanketed around with a coverlid of thoughts as much like the pattern as two peas." Ezekiel seemed to grow an inch at every word, and the brawny pressman looked first at him and then at the press with evident astonishment.

"Talk about the mind's living forever!" exclaimed the boy, pointing patronizingly at the ground, as if mind were lying there incapable of immortality until the printer reached it a helping hand—"why the world is brimful of live, bright, industrious thoughts, which would have been dead as a stone if it hadn't been for boys like me who have run the ink-rollers. Immortality, indeed! Why, people's minds," he continued, with his imagination climbing into the profane sublime—"people's minds would 'at be immortal if 'twasn't for the printers—at any rate in this here planetary burying-ground. We are the chaps what manufacture immortality for dead men," he subjoined by slapping the pressman graciously on the shoulder. The latter took it as if dubbed a knight of the legion of honor; for the boy had put the mysteries of his profession in sublime apocalypse.

"Give us one good healthy mind," resumed Ezekiel, "to think for us, and we will furnish a dozen worlds as big as this with thoughts to order. Give us such a man, and we will insure his life; we will keep him alive forever among the living. He can't die no way you can fix it, when once we have touched him with these here bits of ink powder. He shan't die nor sleep, we will keep his mind at work on the minds that shall come to live here as long as the world stands."

"Ezekiel," I asked, in a subdued tone of reverence, "will you print my thoughts too?" "Yes, that I will," he replied, "if you will think some of the right kind." "Yes that we will," echoed the pressman. And I went home and thought, and Ezekiel has printed my "thought-tracks" ever since.

PRISON REFORM.

We are certain that our readers will read the following incident with great pleasure.—It is from the pen of that highly gifted writer, Mrs. Child. Would to heaven we could witness more of such experiments. Who knows but the day may come when dungeons and chains may be wholly laid aside. When too, the gallows shall no longer be known throughout the world. Thank heaven, society is beginning to realize the great truth that the criminal is a man and a brother. But we leave this beautiful and touching incident to speak for itself.—*Prisoner's Friend.*

"A new State Prison is being built near Plattsburgh, for the purpose of employing convicts in the iron mines. When this subject was first undertaken, the men prisoners at Sing Sing were called together and informed of the nature of the enterprise.

"They were told that the labor of quarrying stone, felling timber, &c., would be very severe; that their condition would render it necessary for them to travel chained, and work chained. Those who were willing to encounter these hardships were requested to hold up their hands. The plan was adopted in order to secure laborers of stout heart, and those who were least adverse to the proposed task. But as the prisoners listened, a vision of the broad blue heavens looked on them kindly, and the green boughs of the forest beckoned cheerfully. The absence of enclosing walls was incentive strong enough for any amount of toil; and they all held up their hands. As it was impossible to take them all, the necessary number was chosen from those most likely to endure fatigue.

"Their place of destination contained no building more secure than a woodland shanty; they were chained to the floor during the night, and through the day they worked in iron fetters. But there are stronger bands than these. Mr. Cook, their superintendent, treated them like a brother. "Nationally and kindly he explained to them that none of the restraints imposed on them were from vindictive motives, that he sincerely desired to do them good, and would gladly enlarge their freedom if he felt confident that they deserved it. He proved the truth of his words by deeds. He was careful to hold the scales of justice with an even hand, and as far as his official duty permitted, he attended to the little wants of each individual. Good behaviour was rewarded with increased marks of confidence.

"Under this influence, it soon became evident that they might be trusted at their daily labor without shackles; and as this had a salutary effect, chains in the night were afterwards dispensed with, also. One hundred and eighty convicts were in the shanties in the woods, and only four keepers to guard them. Did they feel inclined to abuse the confidence bestowed on them? Four or five of the most desperate ruffians did; they tried to seduce the others into a plan of escape. Had they been pinioned and chained, and driven by mere brute force, they would probably have tried the experiment, even at the price of murder. But they had been treated like men, some of them perhaps for the first time in their lives; and this aroused the manhood in them. They saw that their captivity was occasioned by their own errors—that there was a sincere wish to lead them out of this captivity and to do them good. Notwithstanding their immense superiority of numbers, they were not tempted to deceive the man who had treated them like a brother, and who had showed them that he dared to trust them. He had a voluntary guard of one hundred and seventy-five men, bound to him by respect and gratitude. Yet these same men have doubtless knocked down police officers, and might do it again should they fall into their hands; because the usual mode of proceeding excites the tigerhood instead of the manhood in them. It is in vain to call upon criminals to respect those in authority. Character alone demands it. When a thief is sent to catch a thief, the criminal does not perceive very clearly, through this appointed medium, that government is ordained of God. The chaplain of one of our prisons asked one of the convicts, 'What brought you here?'

"Two sheriffs," was the laconic answer. "I mean what brought you into prison?" said the chaplain: "Had liquor nothing to do with it?"

"Yes, they were both drunk," was the shrewd reply.

"Our last resting place."—Why dread to lay down this frail body in its resting place, and this weary, aching head on the pillow of its repose? Why tremble at this, that in the long sleep of the tomb the body shall suffer disease no more, and pain no more, and hear no more, the cries of want, nor the groans of distress; and far retired from the turmoil of life, that violence and change shall pass lightly over it, and the elements shall beat and the storm shall howl unheard around its lowly bed!—*Dewey.*

"Persian Censorship."—The Persian novelist, Cosmar, began one of his recent novels with the incident of the breaking down of a mail coach, in the Leipziger-Strasse of Berlin. The censor struck out this passage as inadmissible, "because His Excellency the General Postmaster Von Nagler, manages the arrangements of the mails with so much care that an accident is impossible."

MUSCULAR STRENGTH.

The power exerted by the action of the muscles in the human body is immense.—Borellus first demonstrated that the force exerted within the body greatly exceeds the weight to be moved, and that nature, in fact, employs an astonishing, we might almost say, superfluous power to move a small weight. It has been calculated that the deltoid muscle alone, which is situated near the top of the shoulder, when employed in supporting a weight of fifty pounds, exerts a force equal to two thousand four hundred and sixty-eight pounds. An idea of the force exerted in the human body when in progressive motion, may be formed from the violence of the shock received when the foot unexpectedly strikes against an object in running. The strongest bones are sometimes fractured by the action of the muscles.

The muscular power in the human body is indeed wonderful. A Turkish porter will trot at a rapid pace, carrying a weight of six hundred pounds. Milo, a celebrated athlete of Crotona, in Italy, early accustomed himself to carry the greatest burthens, and by degrees became a monster in strength. It is said that he carried on his shoulder an ox four years old, weighing upwards of one thousand pounds, for above forty yards, and afterwards killed it with one blow of his fist. He was seven times crowned at the Pythian games, and six at the Olympian. He presented himself the seventh time, but no one had the courage to enter the list against him. He was one of the disciples of Pythagoras, and to his uncommon strength the learned preceptor and his pupils owed their lives. The pillar which supported the roof of the school suddenly gave way, but Milo supported the whole weight of the building and gave the philosopher time to escape. In his old age Milo attempted to pull up a tree by its roots and break it. He partly effected it, but his strength being gradually exhausted, the tree, when cleft, re-united, and his hands remained pinched in the body of it. He was then alone, and being unable to disengage himself, died in that position.

Haller mentions that he saw a man, whose finger being caught in a chain, at the bottom of a mine, by keeping it forcibly bent, supported by that means the weight of his whole body, one hundred and fifty pounds, until he was drawn up to the surface, a height of six hundred feet.

Augustus XI, King of Poland, could roll up a silver plate like a sheet of paper, and twist the strongest horse-shoe asunder.

A Frenchman, who was attached to Rockwell & Stone's Circus, last spring, was able to resist the united strength of four horses, and was witnessed by hundreds in New York and in other places. A lion is said to have left the impression of his teeth upon a piece of solid iron.

The most prodigious power of muscle is exhibited by fish. The whale moves with a velocity through the dense medium of the water that would carry him, if continued at the same rate, round the world in little less than a fortnight; and a sword fish has been known to strike his weapon quite through the oak plank of a ship.

THE ELOQUENCE OF MOTION.—*William C. Preston.*—Every one has read of the action, action, action of Demosthenes, and of what a variety of emotions and passions Hercules could express by mere gesture; let it not be supposed, however, that such perfections of art belong to the ancients only. The following anecdote of the Hon. William C. Preston, is illustrative of our remark:

Some years ago, among a thousand of others, we were listening to one of his splendid harangues from the stump. Beside us was one, as deaf as a post, in breathless attention, catching, apparently, every word that fell from the orator's lips. Now the tears of delight would roll down his cheeks, and now, in an ungovernable ecstasy, he would shout out exclamations, which might have been mistaken for the noise of a small thunder storm.

At length Preston launched out one of those passages of massive declamation which those who have heard him, know him to be so capable of uttering. In magnificent splendor, it was what Byron has described the mountain-storms of Jura. Its effect upon the multitude was like a whirlwind. Our deaf friend could contain himself no longer; but bawling into our ear, as if he would blow it open with a tempest,

"Who's that a speaking?" cried he.

"William C. Preston," replied we—as loud as our lungs would let us.

"Who?" inquired he, still louder than before.

"William C. Preston, of S. Carolina," replied we almost splitting our throat in the effort. "Well! well!"—returned he—"I can't hear a darn word, he or you are saying, but, great Jericho! don't he do the motions splendid?"—*South Carolinian.*

GOOD FEELINGS.—We know a blunt old fellow in the State of Maine who sometimes hit the nail on the head more pat than the philosopher. He once heard a man much praised for his "good feelings." Every body joined and said the man was possessed of excellent feelings.

"What has he done?" asked our old genius. "Oh, in every thing he was a man of fine benevolent feelings," was the reply.

"What has he done?" cried the old fellow again.

By this time the company thought it necessary to show some of their favorite doings. They began to cast about in their minds, but the old man still shouted "what has he done?" They owned they could not name any thing in particular.

"Yet," answered the cynic, "you say that the man has good feelings. Now, gentlemen, let me tell you that there are people in this world who get a good name simply on account of their feelings. You can't tell one generous action that they ever performed in their lives, but they can look and talk most benevolently. I know a man in this town that you would all call a surly, rough and unamiable man, and yet he has done more acts of kindness in this country than all of you together. You judge people's actions by their feelings, but I judge people's feelings by their actions."

STRICT CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. Bonner, in his Temperance address, related the following, which is as applicable to those who require a scripture warrant for breaking the bonds of the slave, as to those who ask for the same authority for signing the tea-total pledge.

"A Temperance agent called upon Jonas Hodge to induce him to sign the Temperance pledge. Jonas replied that he would do so, when convinced that it was his duty; but that he could find no warrant for such a course—no express command to pledge himself to total abstinence.

He afterwards invited his visitor to go with him into his fields and see a very fine horse which he owned. In his eagerness to gaze at the beautiful animal, which was prancing before him, he fell into a well, which happened to be in his path; rising to the surface of the water, in which he had been immersed, he cried lustily to his companion for help.—He determined to let his moderation be known, replied, 'Be patient, Jonas, be patient.' Jonas expostulated, saying that the stones were slippery, that he was benumbed with the cold, and unless assisted soon, he must perish.—'Be patient, Jonas,' replied his importunate companion: 'I cannot act without a warrant—I have taken my bible and commenced with Genesis, examining for the express command to pull Jonas Hodge out of the well: when I find it, I will lend you a helping hand; so hold on patiently, Jonas.'—*Hampshire Herald.*

PARABLE.

A child was playing in the joyous sunshine; among his playthings was an acorn. He lost the acorn in the dirt. This was a misfortune at which he grieved long and sorely. But after a while his grief passed away, and he forgot the occasion of it.

In his indolence, among Nature's favorite objects was a beautiful, vigorous young oak; an emblem of, as well as contemporary with, himself. When he arrived at full manhood the oak was to him an emblem of strength, fortitude and power; and taught him many lessons of the inward love of the heart. It was to him as an early beloved friend, and he rejoiced in it.

His manhood's long, deep joy sprang from that little grief of childhood. But he no longer knew that it did.

As years elapsed, and long after the men who grew from the child who lost the acorn, had finished his mission here, and passed to a higher one, the oak became a gigantic tree, and afforded shelter and shade for the village boys and girls during their pastimes; the young poet and philosopher learned sentiments of beauty and wisdom from it; manhood was strengthened by its influence; age worshipped in its presence, and all were brought near to Nature, and to Nature's soul, by its symbols and emblems.—*Sidney Southwell.*

THE DAISY.—The word daisy is a thousand times pronounced, says Campbell, without adverting to the beauty of its etymology "the eye of day."

ANTI-SLAVERY PUBLICATIONS.

Persons wishing to furnish themselves with anti-slavery Books and Pamphlets, can do so by calling on J. ELIZABETH JONES, one door west of the District School House, Green St.

OUR MOTTO IS

"THE READY PAY."

AND OUR BUSINESS IS TO BUY AND SELL

HARDWARE AND DRUGS

As Low as Possible.—Carpenters, Builders, Farmers, Carriage and Chair Makers, Painters, Cabinet and Harness Makers, Millwrights, and Mechanics generally, will find such articles among our assortment as will suit their separate purposes.

PHYSICIANS

who prescribe for others, and

FAMILIES.

who prescribe for themselves may at all times find a general assortment of

DRUGS AND BOTANIC MEDICINES

at

CHESSMAN & WRIGHTS:

Salem, O., March 28th.

DRY GOODS AND GROCERIES,

BOOTS and SHOES, (Eastern and Western,) Drugs and Medicines, Paints, Oil and Dye Stuffs, cheap as the cheapest, and good as the best, constantly for sale at

TRESCOTTS.

Salem, O. 1st mo. 30th.

J. McCLURE & Co.

DEALERS in Produce, No. 11 Front st.

between Main and Walnut, Cincinnati, Ohio.

AGENTS FOR THE "BUGLE."

OHIO. New Garden—David L. Galbraith
Columbiana—Lot Holmes. Cool Springs—
T. Ellwood Vickers. Berlin—Jacob H. Barnes. Marlboro—Dr. K. G. Thomas.
Canfield—John Wetmore. Lovellville—Dr. Butler. Poland—Christopher Lee. Youngstown—J. S. Johnson. New Lyme—Marsena Miller. Akron—Thomas P. Beach.
NEW LISBON—George Garretson. Cincinnati—William Donaldson. East Fairfield—John Marsh. Selma—Thos. Swynne. Springfield—A. Thomas. Harveysburg—V. Nicholson. Oakland—Elizabeth Brook. Chagrin Falls—S. Dickenson. Malta—James Cope. Columbus—W. W. Pollard. Georgetown—Ruth Cope. Bundysburg—Alex. Glenn. Garrettsville—J. H. Pardee. Atwater—E. Morgan Parrott. Farmington, Trumbull co.—Wm. Smith. Elyria, Lorain co.—A. J. Burrell. Oberlin—Lucy Stone. Ohio City—R. B. Dennis. Newton Falls—Dr. Homer Earle. Ravenna—Wm. Frazier. Franklin Mills—A. Morse. Harford—Anson Gardick. Southington, Trumbull, Co., Ohio.—Caleb Greene—Mt. Union, Owen Thomas.

INDIANA. Greendale—Lewis Brinson. Marion—John T. Morris. Economy—Ira C. Maulsby. Liberty—Edwin Gardner. Winchester—Clarkson Puckett. Knightstown.—Dr. H. I. Terrell. Richmond—Joseph Adelman.

PENNSYLVANIA. Follston—Joseph Coale; H. Vashon, Pittsburgh.